



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,055	11/23/1999	KIMINOBU KODAMA	990612/LH	4616

7590 05/18/2004

FRISHAUF HOLTZ GOODMAN LANGER AND CHICK PC
767 THIRD AVENUE 25TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10017-2023

EXAMINER

MCALLISTER, STEVEN B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3627

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/448,055

Applicant(s)

KODAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Steven B. McAllister

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-4, 6, 8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-4, 6, 8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 35 USC 101 requires that an invention be concrete, tangible, and useful in order to be statutory. However, as understood by the examiner, claim 6 is not statutory because it appears that a plurality of different part combinations could be used in conjunction with an activity to achieve the same attribute of use while ending up with a substantially different product (e.g., using the same welding, polishing, and assembly activities on parts that have the same geometry, but a different size). While claim 6 recites "utilizing parts retrieved in accordance with the activities of the derived manufacturing process", it is not clear how this would be accomplished in an unambiguous way. Therefore, it is not clear how the result would be assured.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Antecedent basis is lacking for "the set series activities".

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Defining parts required for use with particular activities to achieve particular values of attributes of use is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). While the specification speaks to deriving a parts list for a manufacturing process, it does not, as read by the examiner, show initially defining parts required and their associations with the activities for manufacturing a product with certain attributes of use. Without this initial definition, it does not appear that a manufacturing process could be set up or that the parts list could be derived.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Constanza (6,198,980).

Costanza shows defining in a database plurality of attributes of use (comprising e.g., size and function); defining a series product comprising a set of products which have a collection of attributes of use (see e.g., Table VII, col. 29, lines 39-48, and col. 30, line 53); defining activities for achieving particular values of the attributes of use since the activities are shown for achieving the different values of attributes of use within a family (e.g., Table VII); dynamically deriving via computer a manufacturing process for a particular product (e.g., Fig. 3); and producing the product utilizing parts retrieved in accordance with the activities.

As to claim 2, Costanza shows common specifications since they are all motion transmitting devices.

As to claim 3, Costanza shows an attribute of size.

As to claim 4, Costanza shows having a different attribute of use comprising size for each one.

As to claim 8, Costanza shows assembly.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/19/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of Costanza is improper. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant argues that Costanza requires each product to be defined in terms of the process required to manufacture it and that each product must be individually entered in the database. As read by the examiner, these assertions, were they to be admitted, do not appear to contradict any claimed limitation. While claim 6 recites "dynamically deriving on the computer a manufacturing process", it is noted that this text does not appear to require that the step is performed by the computer itself, but rather that it is performed "on the computer". (It is noted that text requiring derivation of a manufacturing process by the computer alone would define over Costanza, since Costanza shows an interactive derivation of the process via entering information on the computer). Dynamically deriving the manufacturing process is consistent with the process of Fig. 3.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3627

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. McAllister whose telephone number is (703) 308-7052. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P. Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Steven B. McAllister